

[1st April 1930]

- (c) Yes. Forms have been standardized for budgets in the case of non-excepted temples, for budgets and for statements of actual receipts and disbursements in the case of maths and excepted temples and for administration reports in the case of committees. On account of financial reasons, no systematic audit of maths and temples has yet been introduced.
- (d) For 25 maths and 545 temples.
- (e) Two and 39 respectively.
- (f) In the case of four temples.

### Excise

#### *Audit of the receipts of the Excise and Registration Departments.*

\* 1790 Q.—Mr. K. P. V. S. MUHAMMAD MEERA RAVUTTAR: Will the Hon'ble the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state whether any, and, if so, what action has been taken by him for the audit of the receipts of the Excise and Registration departments on an independent basis with reference to the policy outlined by him in his speech at page 182 of the Council Proceedings, dated 1st March 1928?

A.—No action was taken.



### Medical

#### *Selection of sub-assistant surgeons.*

\* 1791 Q.—Mr. K. P. V. S. MUHAMMAD MEERA RAVUTTAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

- (a) whether there was a selection in February 1929 for the appointment of sub-assistant surgeons;
- (b) the number of Brahmans, non-Brahman caste Hindus, depressed classes, Anglo-Indians and Muhammadans that applied for the same;
- (c) how many of each community appeared before the Selection Board;
- (d) the number and names of selected candidates in each community and their experience in their profession;
- (e) whether the candidates who were doing semi-Government service in rural dispensaries (municipal and local board) are given preference;
- (f) whether the communal Government Order was applied in the selection of candidates;
- (g) whether they are now provided with appointments; and
- (h) if the answer to (g) is in the negative, what is the reason for the delay in providing them with appointments?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) & (c) The Government have no information.

(d) A list<sup>a</sup> showing the names of the selected candidates and the communities to which they belong is appended. The Government have no information as to their experience in the profession.

(e) The Government have no information.

<sup>a</sup> Printed as Appendix VIII on page 944 infra.



1st April 1930]

(f) In making the selection, due consideration was given to the claims of all communities.

(g) & (h) Some of the selected candidates have been appointed. The others have not been appointed owing to the lack of vacancies.

*Alleged grievances of sub-assistant surgeons.*

\* 1792 Q.—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether any reduction, in the cadre of sub-assistant surgeons by discharging from service, was made within the last five years;

(b) if so, how many sub-assistant surgeons were discharged;

(c) the reason or reasons for discharging them;

(d) whether they were compensated for the loss of service;

(e) if so, how and on what condition or conditions they were compensated and, if not, why not;

(f) whether any and if so how many of them were re-appointed after discharge from service;

(g) what was the order of re-entertainment;

(h) whether they were started on the pay they were drawing at the time of discharge;

(i) if not, why not;

(j) whether any and if so how many of them were confirmed in the department after re-appointment;

(k) whether the Government have received memorials from the discharged and re-entertained sub-assistant surgeons requesting to fix the initial pay at not less than the pay they were drawing at the time of discharge;

(l) if so, what action has been taken or is proposed to be taken on the memorials; and

(m) whether it is a fact that some junior sub-assistant surgeons have become seniors and have been drawing higher pay than their seniors before discharge in consequence of the former's earlier re-appointment, and if so, whether any action has been taken to rectify this anomaly?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) One hundred and fifty permanent sub-assistant surgeons were discharged or compulsorily retired between the years 1923 and 1927 on account of—

(1) the reduction of the leave and casualty reserve under the retrenchment scheme, and

(2) the employment by local bodies of private medical practitioners to hold posts previously held by Government medical officers.

(d) & (e) The officers were granted pension or gratuity admissible to them under the Civil Service Regulations.

(f) Sixty-four sub-assistant surgeons with good records who applied for re-employment have been re-appointed.